



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/594,695	01/10/2007	Tetsu Akiyama	3190-101	8066
33432	7590	04/16/2009	EXAMINER	
KILYK & BOWERSOX, P.L.L.C.			LI, QIAN JANICE	
400 HOLIDAY COURT				
SUITE 102			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WARRENTON, VA 20186			1633	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/16/2009	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/594,695	AKIYAMA ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Q. JANICE LI	1633

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 January 1933.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) 1-33 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restrictions*

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S. C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-5, 19-23 are drawn to an agent for enhancing sFRP expression or function comprising a compound having an effect of enhancing the expression and/or function of Dlg. Classification is to be determined depending on the nature of the agent (Depending on the nature of the agent, this group may embrace more than one inventions).
  - II. Claims 6-12, 24-32 are drawn to a method for enhancing sFRP expression or function which may be asserted by using one of the agents of group I. Classification is to be determined depending on the means used for the step (Depending on the means used, this invention may embrace more than one invention).
  - III. Claims 13-15, 33 are drawn to a method of identifying a compound using a non-human mammal deficient in one of the Dlg alleles, or cells from the mammal, wherein the compound having an effect of enhancing the expression and/or function of Dlg. Classified in class 800, subclass 3.
  - IV. Claims 13-15, 33 are drawn to a method of identifying a compound using a non-human mammal deficient in one of the Dlg alleles, or cells from the mammal, wherein the compound having an effect of enhancing the expression and/or function of sFRP. Classified in class 800, subclass 3.

- V. Claims 13-15, 33 are drawn to a method of identifying a compound using a non-human mammal deficient in one of the Dlg alleles, or cells from the mammal, wherein the compound inhibits tumor formation. Classified in class 800, subclass 3.
- VI. Claims 16 and 17 are drawn to a non-human mammal deficient in one or both of the Dlg alleles. Classified in class 800, subclass 13.
- VII. Claim 18 is directed to a method of examining a tumor tissue. Classification is to be determined depending on the means of examination/detection.  
(Depending on the means of examination, the group may embrace more than one invention).

2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons. Inventions II-VII and I are directed to related inventions. The related inventions are distinct if the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants; and the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the different inventions are directed to structural distinct agents and mammals, and different methods of using structural different agents, mammals and cells.

Moreover, group I further embraces numerous compounds that are structurally distinct, group II further embraces numerous means for enhancing sFRP expression or function, which could be achieved through means beyond enhancing the expression of

Dlg gene. Each of the compounds and means holds a separate status in the art, requires different search criteria and classification. Upon election of one of groups I and II, further election of a compound or a means is required. For example, a recombinant vector containing a Dlg gene or a method of administering a Dlg protein for enhancing sFRP expression. Note this is an election of invention, not a species election.

Group VII embraces numerous means of measuring and detecting the expression and function of Dlg in a test tissue. Upon election of group VII, further election of a specific means is required. Note this is an election of invention, not a species election.

Inventions group II and I are related as product and process of use. Inventions VI and III-V are related as product and process of use. Inventions VI and III-V are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). Further, a search for the invention of the groups would not be coextensive because a search indicating the process is novel or unobvious would not extend to a holding that the product itself is novel or unobvious; similarly, a search indicating that the product is known or would have been obvious would not extend to a holding that the process is known or would have been obvious. Further, the inventions raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Therefore, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all the inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

**Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.**

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time

of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverses the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter and different search criteria, a serious burden is imposed on the Office to perform a complete search of the defined areas in both the patent and non-patent literature if all the groups are examined together. Therefore, the restriction set forth is proper and not to restrict would impose a serious burden in the examination of this application.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of**

**the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See “Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b),” 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

The differences of the Inventions I-VII are further underscored by their divergent classification and independent search criteria.

3. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is advised that where a single claim encompasses more than one invention as defined above, upon election of an invention for examination, said claim will only be examined to the extent that it reads upon the elected invention.

4. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Q. Janice Li** whose telephone number is **571-272-0730**. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 am - 7:30 p.m., Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Joseph Woitach** can be reached on **571-272-0739**. The **fax** numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are **571-273-8300**. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to (571) 272-0547.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at **800-786-9199**.

*/Q. JANICE LI, M.D./  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1633*

Q. Janice Li, M.D.  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1633

*QJL*  
April 16, 2009